UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/674,723	09/29/2003	Harold F. Carrison	03-119 (US01)	3995
⁴¹⁶⁹⁶ VISTA IP LAW	7590 03/05/200 V GROUP LLP	EXAMINER		
12930 Saratoga		COMSTOCK, DAVID C		
Suite D-2 Saratoga, CA 9:	5070	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3733	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/05/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		1	Application No.		Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary			10/674,723		CARRISON ET AL.			
			Examiner		Art Unit			
		ı	DAVID COMS	тоск	3733			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun or Reply	nication appea	ars on the co	ver sheet with the c	correspondence ad	dress		
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE Masions of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this composition of the properties of the maximum state of the properties of the	MAILING DAT s of 37 CFR 1.136(munication. tatutory period will v will, by statute, ca	FE OF THIS (a). In no event, he apply and will expand the applications.	COMMUNICATION to wever, may a reply be tindependent of the state of th	N. nely filed the mailing date of this of D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	•		
Status								
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on 02 Nov	ember 2007					
2a)□	, ,	2b)⊠ This a		•				
3)		<i>'</i> —			secution as to the	e merits is		
<u>ا</u>	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	on of Claims							
4)🖂	Claim(s) <u>1-4,6-10 and 12-16</u> is/are	pending in the	e application					
-	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/a	_						
	Claim(s) <u>8-10 and 12-16</u> is/are allowed.							
·	Claim(s) <u>6-70 und 72-70</u> is/are rejected.							
·	Claim(s) 6 is/are objected to.							
,—	Claim(s) are subject to restrict	ction and/or e	election reau	irement.				
	on Papers							
-	The specification is objected to by th							
10)⊠	The drawing(s) filed on <u>23 January 2</u>			·— •	· ·	ier.		
	Applicant may not request that any obje			-				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including	g the correction	n is required it	the drawing(s) is ob	jected to. See 37 C	FR 1.121(d).		
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to	o by the Exar	miner. Note	the attached Office	Action or form P	ΓΟ-152.		
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 								
2) Notice (3) Inform	re of References Cited (PTO-892) re of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (F mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	PTO-948)	4) 5)	Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da Notice of Informal F	ate			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) L Other:								

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see pre-appeal brief request for review, filed 02

November 2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of the claims as amended on 27 April

2007 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection has been made as set forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat. No. 103,039 (Gerecke) in view of US Pat. No. 111,475 (Roble).

Gerecke discloses a device comprising a pair of rigid members each having a proximal portion A and a distal portion wherein are mounted a plurality of flutes B (see Figure). The device is configured to be placed in a collapsed state wherein the flutes are in an interposed arrangement with respective proximal portions of the first and second members spaced apart from each other. The device comprises a hinge. At least a distal portion of the device would be capable of fitting within a vertebra. Gerecke

Art Unit: 3733

does not explicitly disclose using a biocompatible material or a plurality of flutes on both members. However, Roble discloses a similar device and teaches that a plurality of flutes can be used on both members "to facilitate the operation and give a more satisfactory finish to the work." (See, e.g., Fig. 1 and col. 1, lines 10-13.) Regarding the material used, it would have been obvious to have formed the device from, for example, titanium (which is biocompatible) in order to make the device light and strong.

Moreover, it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

Allowable Subject Matter

Method claims 8-10 and 12-16 are allowable over the prior art of record.

Claim 6 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Comstock whose telephone number is (571) 272-4710 (a detailed message should be left if Examiner is unavailable). If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone or voicemail are unsuccessful, the examiner's

Application/Control Number: 10/674,723 Page 4

Art Unit: 3733

supervisor, Eduardo Robert, can be reached at (571) 272-4719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/DC/

/Eduardo C. Robert/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3733